

**Expansion Subcommittee Meeting**  
**World Class Conference Room, Kilroy Building, Sea Tac**  
**January 6, 2006, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.**

Scribe: Searetha Kelly

Name	Organization	Phone	e-mail
<b><i>Subcommittee Members</i></b>			
Olivia Yang (Lead) Present	UW, Capital Projects	206-221-4224	<a href="mailto:oyang@u.washington.edu">oyang@u.washington.edu</a>
Butch Reifert Absent	Design Industry	206-441-4151	<a href="mailto:breifert@mahlum.com">breifert@mahlum.com</a>
Ed Kommers Present	Mechanical Contractors	206-612-7304	<a href="mailto:ekommers@comcast.net">ekommers@comcast.net</a>
Dave Johnson Absent  Note: Terry Tilton attended for Dave Johnson Present	Wa. State Bldg. & Construction Trades Council	360-357-6778	<a href="mailto:DJIW86@aol.com">DJIW86@aol.com</a>
John Lynch Present by Conference Call from California	General Administration	360-902-7227	<a href="mailto:jlynch@ga.wa.gov">jlynch@ga.wa.gov</a>
Gary Ballew Absent	Benton County	509-736-3082	<a href="mailto:gary.ballew@co.benton.wa">gary.ballew@co.benton.wa</a>
Rodney Eng Present	City of Seattle	206-684-8241	<a href="mailto:rodney.eng.@seattle.gov">rodney.eng.@seattle.gov</a>
Michael Mequet Present	Port of Seattle	206-835-7637	<a href="mailto:mequet.m@portseattle.org">mequet.m@portseattle.org</a>
Nora Huey Present	King County	206-684-2049	<a href="mailto:norahuey@metrokc.gov">norahuey@metrokc.gov</a>
Tom Peterson Present	Hoffman Construction	206-286-8697	<a href="mailto:tom-peterson@hoffmancorp.com">tom-peterson@hoffmancorp.com</a>
Rick Slunaker Absent  Note: Michael Transue attended for him	AGC	360-352-0998  253-223-2508	<a href="mailto:rslunaker@agcwa.com">rslunaker@agcwa.com</a>  <a href="mailto:cmjtransue@comcast.net">cmjtransue@comcast.net</a>
Ashley Probart Present	Assoc. of Wash. Cities	360-753-4137	<a href="mailto:ashleyp@awcnet.org">ashleyp@awcnet.org</a>
Larry Byers Present	Contracts Bonding & Insurance Company	206-628-7221	<a href="mailto:larryb@cbic.com">larryb@cbic.com</a>

***Other Attendees***

Dick Goldsmith Absent	Assn of WA Hospital Districts	206-216-2528	<a href="mailto:richardg@awphd.org">richardg@awphd.org</a>
Stan Bowman	AIA/WA	360-943-6012	<a href="mailto:bowman@aiawa.org">bowman@aiawa.org</a>
Ginger Eagle	Washington Ports	360-943-0760	<a href="mailto:geagle@washingtonports.org">geagle@washingtonports.org</a>
Dan Vaught	School District Review Board	425-489-6603	<a href="mailto:dvaught@nsd.org">dvaught@nsd.org</a>
Charlie Brown	King/Pierce County School Coalitions	253-906-6685	
Dick Lutz	Centennial Cont.	360-867-9443	<a href="mailto:dicklutz@comcast.net">dicklutz@comcast.net</a>
Larry Stevens	MCA/NECA	253-212-1536	<a href="mailto:lwstevens@wwdb.org">lwstevens@wwdb.org</a>
Nancy Deakins	General Administration	360-902-8161	<a href="mailto:deakink@dshs.wa.gov">deakink@dshs.wa.gov</a>

## Meeting Notes

### **1: Subcommittee Membership**

Roger Benson (Mortenson) and Richard Goldsmith (Public Hospitals) asked to become members of the Expansion Subcommittee.

Ms. Yang said that we can put them on a standby list or expand past the 15 person membership limit.

Mr. Kommers thinks we should expand the membership list past 15 individuals, both Roger and Richard are very active.

Mr. Lutz said it is good to have enough people to do the work.

**Ms. Yang noted that consensus was that Subcommittee will recommend Roger Benson and Richard Goldsmith to the full board next week to expand the membership list for this subcommittee.**

### **2: School District Presentation**

Mr Brown and Mr. Vaught made a presentation of School District projects needing GCCM authorization for 2006. Mr Vaught distributed a handout (can be sent to us electronically) which has an:

- Overview of every project reviewed
- When submitted
- Brief outline with comments

Mr. Vaught's goal is to make sure the presentation will work for the CPARB Meeting 5 on January 12<sup>th</sup> and that they are on the right track and have the appropriate materials in place. Mr Vaught also handed out draft of legislation, which is second draft, and reflects comments given to them from the December full board meeting.

Ms. Deakins stated the Legislature will want to not just see submittal packages, but would like to see results from each of these projects.

Mr. Vaught said only three of the projects are completed. The others are in various stages of design and bidding.

Mr. Brown said that the proposal is 2006 only . Only talking about projects \$10 million and over, ten projects for 2006.

Mr Brown said that the School Districts are assuming that projects beyond 2006 will be part of overall authorization 07-09. There is \$2.3 billion worth of bonds put on the February 2006 ballot in the Puget Sound area alone. School districts are looking at a potentially busy school construction season.

Mr. Lynch asked which were completed, and that the chart showed number of projects scheduled to be completed by a specific date.

Mr. Eng asked if we indicate if the project is going smoothly or not, for example, finished at within 3% MACC contingency.

Mr. Vaught says that they can do some generic baseline measuring goals, as well as comparisons of GCCM vs. DBB projects. There is no real data collection that has come out of OSPI.

Mr. Transue noted the amount of bonding for schools but that money in bank not part of the criteria. The issue is whether projects meet criteria in legislation.

Mr. Eng asked do they review qualifications of the school district teams to do GCCM or DBB? Mr. Eng stated that we need to know if owners are coming with a good team.

Mr. Vaught said he will clarify it for the January 12<sup>th</sup> CPARB meeting – qualification of teams is a top filter in the matrix. There are a lot of districts that have brought in consultants to meet GCCM criteria.

Mr. Brown said that 80% of the projects were approved with the contingency that they would get consultants with the criteria. School Districts take it very seriously.

Mr. Brown passed around several example submittal packages to include, but not limited to Seattle (Cleveland High School). It includes:

- Program scheduling
- Completion of Project
- Why does project meet GCCM qualifications
- Architects
- Construction Cost
- Budget Schedule

Mr. Peterson asked how long do review sessions take?

Mr. Brown they review approximately five projects and it takes more than half a day to process and the review location is at the AGC office in Tacoma (some instances). It also depends on the project and how long it will take. We usually have:

- 30 minutes for each presentation and questions and answers
- Committee thanks and excuses them
- Then the next group comes in for their presentation
- Motions are then made

- Approval or decline or contention approval

Mr. Vaught said they get the submittal packets two to three weeks in advance of their presentation. There is a good amount of deliberation during the post presentation.

Mr. Transue asked that Mr Brown and Mr Vaught verify that all the projects listed.

Ms. Deakins asked about the composition of the review board. Could the presentation also show the diversity of the Board. Mr Brown said that the representation is all in the statute explicitly.

There was considerable discussion on the number of projects being requested (ten for 2006).

Mr. Lynch asked how many projects per year have we been doing? If it is the same amount each year, then it looks like business as usual.

Mr. Lynch also noted that 10 projects might appear to be a big number for a one year period, understanding that it is contingent on qualified projects coming forward

Mr. Brown said there are only three may be approved.

Mr. Eng said the if the Project Review Board is effectively functioning, there should be no limit on the number of projects to be reviewed. If you take all ten projects, you must be clear you are not just rubber stamping them.

Mr. Bowman stated we must be cautious with only three projects completed. There is a severe lack of data, particularly until more projects are completed. Concerned about diversity of contractors and number of architects involved. Ten is a big number with no data to back it up. Ten seems to be an arbitrary number.

Mr. Brown said the number ten is based on a small number of districts and the complexity of their projects.

Mr. Bowman said that we don't have a lot of data regarding completed projects.

Mr. Bowman said it is still not fully demonstrates that alternative public works has value for school districts and hospitals. We should focus on 2007 and what we will do with the overall law.

Ms. Deakins said that she has concerns regarding the ten projects. We will get rough results information on where people are on their projects. We have to prove/show if it is working well to the Review Board and the Legislature. There are demonstration projects (and can reduce their numbers of questions).

Mr. Vaught said that two of the completed projects are within the school district he works for. It will be challenging to get the other fourteen projects organized in a similar kind of way.

Ms. Yang asked that school district come back to CPARB with some modifications to information presented: categorize by project maturity (which completed, in construction, in design) and add metrics

Mr. Vaught will get as much done as he can before the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. He is willing to expand on some development of the metrics if everyone feels they are useful. He will talk about the review process at the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. He will also be handing out all their meeting minutes to discuss criteria and the approval process. Also, he will do his best to update us on where all the projects are.

Mr. Vaught and Ms. Deakins will collaborate on picking representative examples for the January 12<sup>th</sup> CPARB meeting, showing two approved and two declined projects from different school districts if possible. It was agreed that the sample applications are more useful than a PowerPoint presentations. Mr. Vaught asked if the subcommittee would rather have handouts or overhead for the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was agreed that handouts would be helpful.

**Ms. Yang said next week (January 12<sup>th</sup>) she will report that school districts have sent a second draft of the Legislation and that there was discussion on the number of projects (ten), and the review board process.**

### **3. 2006 Subcommittee Work Plan**

The remaining time was spent planning how to accomplish subcommittee work in 2006.

Mr. Eng asked if there is an overlap of duties between the reauthorization and expansion subcommittees. It was agreed that now is too early to cut off discussions in both subcommittees. It was agreed that it was good to get diversity of solutions and will result in good discussions. He can see the benefit of having both subcommittees work on some similar areas.

Mr. Kommers suggested focusing on what kinds of projects GCCM was designed to accommodate: Characterizations of projects that GCCM is appropriate.

Mr. Lynch suggested a single oversight board looking at project approval. Mr. Eng said working through the bureaucracy and adding a whole other level of bureaucracy (when the system is already slow enough). If you add on a four-tiered review process and individuals have to put together their packages, it is more work.

Mr. Transue stated that we could lay it out as a tier analysis:

1. Met the criteria?
2. Owner qualified?

Mr. Transue said we should start with project if it qualifies. Then relate to owner (training/orientation). Then go through tier analysis, you either qualify or you don't.

Mr. Kommers stated that he felt JOCand Design Build should be considered after 07.

Mr. Transue agrees with Mr. Eng's plan listed on page 14 (bottom).

Mr. Lynch says we need to have time to put together the reauthorization issues first, then throw new issues on the table later. Mr. Bowman agreed with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Lutz feels strongly that we should look at all three methods:

- GCCM
- JOC
- DB

Mr. Bowman said he is seeing jurisdictions do things under DB that are not lawful. They were not authorized, but did it anyway.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following work plan was agreed upon:

February 06	March 06	April 06	May 06	June 06	July 06
GCCM Proj Examples by Owner s & GCCMs (what projs are/are not applicable to GCCM)?	GCCM Proj	GCCM Owner  DB Owner  JOC Owner	GCCM Owner  DB Owner  JOC Owner	DB	JOC

It was also agreed that in order to keep progress, subcommittee would work on draft legislation each month, as discussion progressed.

### **Meeting Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:10 a.m.